

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

AMANDA U. LEVY,
Plaintiff,

vs.

MACY'S, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:13-cv-147
Barrett, J.
Litkovitz, M.J.

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**

This matter is before the Court on defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint on the grounds it is frivolous and fails to state a claim to relief (Doc. 10), plaintiff's response in opposition to the motion (Doc. 13), and defendant's reply in support of the motion (Doc. 21). The matter is also before the Court on defendant's motion to strike plaintiff's second amended complaint (Doc. 20). Also pending before the Court are plaintiff's motion for relief on a certain date (Doc. 14), revised motion for relief (Doc. 15), motion to strike the first motion to dismiss and to receive court documents via email (Doc. 25), and motions to amend/supplement the complaint (Docs. 24, 27).

I. Plaintiff's history of litigation in the federal courts

To describe plaintiff Amanda U. Levy as a "frequent filer" would be an understatement. Plaintiff has filed well over 350 lawsuits in federal courts nationwide.¹ She has filed lawsuits under the names Amanda Levy, Amanda Ajuluchuku, and Amanda Ajuluchuku-Levy.² As the

¹ See <https://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/dquery.pl> (accessed on October 17, 2013, list attached). The Court can take judicial notice of matters of public record, including court records available through the PACER system via the internet. *Landt v. Farley*, No. 4:112CV0740, 2012 WL 4473209, at *1, n.2 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 26, 2012) (citation omitted).

² Several courts have recognized that Amanda U. Levy and Amanda U. Ajuluchuku are the same person. *Levy v. 7-Eleven Stores*, 3:13-CV-2177-M-BK, 2013 WL 4017161, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2013) (citing *Levy v. Rite Corporation*, No. 1:13-CV-0629, Memorandum at 8 (M.D. Pa. Apr. 22, 2013); *Levy v. Hyatt Hotels Corp.*, 1:13-CV-2005, Order at 2 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 20, 2013)).

attached list of plaintiff's filings shows, plaintiff has sued dozens of defendants, some of them repeatedly. See <https://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/dquery.pl> (list attached). District courts, including one judge from this district, have previously acknowledged that plaintiff has "a lengthy history of filing frivolous lawsuits in federal court." *Levy v. Limited Brands*, No. 2:13-cv-67 (S.D. Ohio June 20, 2013) (Graham, J.) (Doc. 28, p. 3 n.1) (citing *Levy v. Hyatt Hotels Corp.*, No. 1:13-cv-2005 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 20, 2013) (court noted that plaintiff had filed at least 267 federal lawsuits)). See also *Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Schleifer*, No. 08 CV 1752 (SJF)(AKT), 2009 WL 4890768, at *7 (E.D. N.Y. Dec. 15, 2009) (stating that as of the date of the court's order, plaintiff had filed 258 actions in various district courts across the nation and that several courts had noted the majority of the lawsuits were "totally without merit"); *Ajuluchuku v. S. New England Sch. of Law*, No. CIV1:05-MI-0251, *et seq.*, 2006 WL 2661232 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 14, 2006) (court issued order disposing of more than 30 civil complaints filed by plaintiff, including 32 filed *in forma pauperis*, and took note that plaintiff had filed over 192 separate civil complaints across the country over a three-year time span, seeking to proceed *in forma pauperis* in almost every case) (citing *Ajuluchuku v. YUM! Brand, Inc., Ltd.*, No. Civ.A. 3:05CV-826-H, 2006 WL 1523218, at *2 (W.D. Ky. May 23, 2006)). Almost all of plaintiff's actions have been dismissed shortly after being filed. See *YUM! Brand, Inc.*, No. 3:05CV-826-H, 2006 WL 1523218, at *2 (noting that most of plaintiff's cases were closed less than 90 days after the complaint was filed and that although the Court did not have the time and resources to extensively review each such case, "a sampling indicate[d] that the overwhelming majority of them were dismissed as frivolous and lacking any merit whatsoever").

A review of some of the cases filed by plaintiff prior to the instant lawsuit indicates that

many of those complaints asserted a claim of disability or other discrimination based on bizarre circumstances such as those alleged here. *See, e.g., Ajuluchuku v. Wendy's International Inc.*, No. 2:05-cv-942 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 6, 2005) (Sargus, J.) (alleging discrimination, including disability discrimination, based on receipt of a fake dollar coin as change for restaurant food purchase in Seattle and seeking \$2 trillion in damages); *Levy v. 7-Eleven Stores*, No. 3:13-CV-2177-M-BK., 2013 WL 4017161, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2013) (alleging a female employee at defendant's Los Angeles store had "sexually harassed, bullied and falsely imprisoned" plaintiff by calling her "Sweetheart" and that "the trauma caused her to sustain neck injuries"; that an employee at defendant's store in Sacramento "defamed, bullied and falsely imprisoned her in March 2013"; that "sexual harassment and false imprisonment are bullying," and "some women have bullied [plaintiff] all her life for not aging"; and "since then she began to promote the economy by suing corporations for acts of discrimination"); *Ajuluchuku-Levy v. CVS Corp.*, C.A. No. 08-538S, 2009 WL 229970, at *2 (D.R.I. Jan. 30, 2009) (alleging plaintiff was intentionally discriminated against because of her disability and race and subjected to "systematic acts of terrorism by the unnecessary badgering" when defendant refused to exchange without a receipt a duffel bag she had purchased, and seeking damages of \$9 trillion); *Ajuluchuku v. Bank of America Corp.*, Nos. 3:06-cv-60, *et seq.*, 2007 WL 952015, at *1 (W.D. N.C. March 27, 2007) (alleging in complaint seeking trillions of dollars in damages against McDonald's Corp. and other defendants that after inquiring about Equal/Splenda at McDonald's restaurant in North Carolina, asking to speak to the manager and being given a phone number that no one answered, and then calling the police to complain about "the ongoing discrimination," defendants ordered her out of their restaurant, which caused plaintiff to suffer seizures and other injuries).

The Southern District of Ohio has not been immune to plaintiff's frivolous filings. Plaintiff has filed five lawsuits in this district. In addition to the lawsuit she filed in 2005 against Wendy's International Inc., (Case No. 2:05-cv-942), plaintiff filed four additional lawsuits in this district, including the present action, between January and March 2013. *See Levy v. Limited Brands*, Case No. 2:13-cv-067 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 25, 2013)³; *Levy v. Bloomingdales (Macy's)*, Case No. 1:13-cv-128 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 19, 2013); *Levy v. Macy's (Century City)*, Case No. 1:13-cv-148 (S.D. Ohio March 14, 2013).

II. The present lawsuit is frivolous and should be dismissed.

Defendant Macy's Inc. ("Macy's") moves to dismiss the complaint (Doc. 3) and the amended complaint (Doc. 7) filed in the instant lawsuit as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and for failure to state a claim to relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (Doc. 10).

In enacting the original *in forma pauperis* statute, Congress recognized that a "litigant whose filing fees and court costs are assumed by the public, unlike a paying litigant, lacks an economic incentive to refrain from filing frivolous, malicious, or repetitive lawsuits." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)). To prevent such abusive litigation, Congress has authorized federal courts to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint if the court is satisfied that the action is frivolous or malicious. *Id.*; see 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A complaint may be dismissed as frivolous when the plaintiff cannot make any claim with a rational or arguable basis in either fact or law. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S.

³ The complaint in that case has been dismissed. The complaint alleged disability discrimination, breach of contract, and personal injury based on allegations defendant broke a promise made over the telephone to plaintiff in California that if she would come to New York, she would be assigned as a model for Victoria's Secret, one of defendant's corporate subsidiaries. (Doc. 28, June 20, 2013 Order).

at 327-28. *See also Perry v. Broadcast Music, Inc.*, 23 F. App'x 210, 211 (6th Cir. 2001). An action has no arguable legal basis when the plaintiff claims a violation of a legal interest which clearly does not exist. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. An action has no arguable factual basis when the allegations are delusional or rise to the level of the irrational or “wholly incredible.” *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 32-33; *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196, 1199 (6th Cir. 1990).

To withstand a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), plaintiff’s complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The Court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true, but need not “accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quoting *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)).

It is well-settled that a document filed pro se is “to be liberally construed,” and that a pro se complaint, “however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers[.]” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). However, the Sixth Circuit has recognized that the Supreme Court’s “liberal construction” case law has not had the effect of “abrogat[ing] basic pleading essentials” in pro se suits. *Wells v. Brown*, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989). Courts are not required to devote time to a case when the nature of a pro se plaintiff’s claim “defies comprehension.” *Roper v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 1:09cv427, 2010 WL 2670827, at *3 (S.D. Ohio

April 6, 2010) (citation omitted).

In the instant case, plaintiff's allegations are nonsensical, baseless, and delusional. Plaintiff alleges in the original complaint that on July 10, 2012, she visited one of defendant's Sacramento, California stores located in Arden Mall to purchase Elizabeth Arden products which defendant was promoting. (Doc. 3 at 1). Two Caucasian women and one African-American woman "shooed her" and refused to sell these products to plaintiff; instead, they preferred to send her to Sunrise Mall. (*Id.*). Someone acknowledged having Elizabeth Arden products in Arden Mall. Plaintiff alleges she "also" suffered discrimination in defendant's Los Angeles store in June 2012, and she consequently fell sideways and injured her ankle. (*Id.*). Plaintiff alleges:

Some women have bullied me all my life for not growing. My own son has outgrown me in age and height. I truly believe Defendant's female salespersons maliciously bullied me on July 10, 2012. My father was born on February 10. When he was alive, he festooned me with unconditional love. Apart from promoting the economy, lawsuits are supposed to make us better citizens. It's one human race. They help us accommodate persons with physical disabilities.

(*Id.* at 1-2).

Plaintiff claims she suffered discrimination in public accommodation based upon her national origin (she alleges her father was Nigerian) and physical disability. (*Id.* at 2). Plaintiff claims she is disabled under the ADA, and she describes her disability as follows, referring to herself in the third person:

She has problems with walking, standing, running, hearing, driving, aging etc. When she was two years old, she fell down and injured the center of her head. It was split into two. She could not grow past 8 years old. It was not until she became pregnant with her son she grew. He gave her stem cells. Since his birth, she stopped growing. He has outgrown her. Sometimes, she walks with a cane. She drives about twenty-five miles an hour on the streets and freeways. She can't age without her children. Given that she drives about twenty miles an hour, Dr. Mark Schwartz issued her a permanent disabled placard. It renews automatically every two years.

(*Id.* at 4).

Plaintiff also claims that defendant committed the torts of assault and battery (“Defendant committed assault and battery. Shooing is both an assault and battery”); negligence; “personal injury tort” in that she suffered bruises, darkened skin on her face and neck, and rashes because of undue stress resulting from defendant’s “mal conduct”; and breach of oral contract because defendant promised to sell her Elizabeth Arden products and instead sent her to Sunrise Mall. (*Id.* at 2-3). As relief plaintiff seeks \$2 million dollars in compensatory damages for undue stress, pain and suffering related to her personal injuries, out of pocket medical expenses, “permanent damage to her body,” embarrassment, humiliation, and discrimination based on national origin and disability; future medical treatment for her injuries; and punitive damages to deter such malicious and oppressive conduct by defendant in the future. (*Id.* at 4).

The allegations of the amended complaint are similar except that plaintiff has added sections on “Types of bullying” and “Facts on bullying” in which she describes certain types of bullying and alleges:

Defendant intentionally bullied me. They oust their victims from events. When they invite them, they harm or kill them. I am submitting my Certificate of Interested Parties. More than 48 states, including Ohio have adopted anti-bullying laws.

(Doc. 7 at 2-3).

Plaintiff’s complaint⁴ contains factual allegations that are nothing more than “delusional,” “irrational,” and “wholly incredible,” and the complaint is therefore “factually frivolous.” *See Denton*, 504 U.S. at 32-33. The complaint includes legal conclusions, but they

⁴ The Court will refer to both the complaint and the amended complaint as the “complaint” as both contain essentially the same allegations and the same claims.

are unsupported by coherent factual allegations to enable the Court to conclude that the complaint states a plausible claim for relief against the named defendant. The complaint provides no factual content or context from which the Court may reasonably infer that the defendant violated plaintiff's federal rights. There is no logical construction of plaintiff's complaint from which the Court can divine a viable claim against defendant over which the Court might have jurisdiction. Nor does plaintiff cite any facts or law in response to defendant's motions showing her claims have any merit, that amendment of the complaint would not be futile, or that she is entitled to any of the other relief sought.

Because plaintiff's complaint against defendant is incomprehensible, baseless, and delusional, the complaint should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) on the ground it is frivolous and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) on the ground it fails to state a claim to relief.

Plaintiff's motions for leave to amend or supplement the complaint (Docs. 24, 27) should be denied because any further amendments to the complaint would clearly be futile. *See Coe v. Bell*, 161 F.3d 320, 341-42 (6th Cir. 1998) (citing *Brooks v. Celeste*, 39 F.3d 125, 130 (6th Cir. 1994)).

III. Plaintiff should be sanctioned to prevent future frivolous filings.

Ms. Levy's repeated filing of frivolous and vexatious lawsuits such as the present lawsuit has caused courts across the country to sanction her. Many districts have declared plaintiff to be a vexatious litigator, have required her to obtain permission before filing suit, or have imposed other restrictions to curb her filing of frivolous lawsuits. *Limited Brands*, No. 2:13-cv-67 (S.D. Ohio June 20, 2013) (Graham, J.) (Doc. 28, pp. 2-3 n.1) (citing *Levy v. Hyatt Hotels Corp.*, No.

1:13-cv-2005 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 20, 2013) (plaintiff has been restricted by many districts from filing suit without leave of court); *S. New England Sch. of Law*, No. CIVA1:05-MI-0251, *et seq.*, 2006 WL 2661232, at *7 (Georgia district court declared plaintiff “a vexatious litigant” and ordered that plaintiff be restricted from filing any civil complaints without payment of the full statutory filing fee; required that any such filing be accompanied by (1) a certification that neither the claims alleged nor the named defendants have been the subject of a pending law suit in any federal or state court and (2) a copy of the restraining order entered by the district judge in that district and a copy of all other restraining orders entered in any district or state court; and required that plaintiff post a \$10,000 bond simultaneous with the filing of any civil complaint “to cover the likely award of costs and attorneys’ fees to the next defendant victimized by one of plaintiff’s frivolous filings”); *Yum! Brand, Inc., Ltd*, 3:05cv-826H, 2006 WL 1523218, at *3 (court entirely restricted plaintiff from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in any future action before the court); *Ajuluchuku v. Wachovia Corp.*, No. 3:06-CV-0612, 2006 WL 2795540, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 27, 2006) (court sanctioned plaintiff for continuous filing of frivolous lawsuits and misuse of the judicial system and barred her from filing any civil actions in that district court until her sanctions were paid).

The filing of frivolous lawsuits and motions strains an already burdened judicial system. As the Supreme Court has recognized: “Every paper filed with the Clerk of . . . Court, no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the [Court’s] limited resources. A part of the Court’s responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice.” *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989). “The goal of fairly dispensing justice . . . is compromised when the Court is forced to devote its limited resources to the

processing of repetitious and frivolous requests.” *In re Sindram*, 498 U.S. 177, 179-80 (1991).

“Frivolous, vexatious, and repeated filings by pro se litigants interfere with the orderly administration of justice by diverting scarce judicial resources from cases having merit. . . .”

U.S. ex rel. Verdon v. Circuit Court for Taylor County, 73 F.3d 669, 671 (7th Cir. 1995). *See also Purk v. United States*, No. 3:03-cv-287, 2005 WL 776135, at *3 (S.D. Ohio 2005) (Report and Recommendation), *adopted*, 2005 WL 2124157 (S.D. Ohio Aug 30, 2005). “[O]ne acting pro se has no license to harass others, clog the judicial machinery with meritless litigation, and abuse already overloaded court dockets.” *Bradley v. Wallrad*, No. 1:06-cv-246, 2006 WL 1133220, at *1 n.2 (S.D. Ohio April 27, 2006) (quotation omitted).

When a litigant abuses the judicial system by repeatedly filing frivolous lawsuits or motions, sanctions are appropriate. The Court may not absolutely foreclose an individual from initiating an action or pursuing an appeal in federal court. *Ortman v. Thomas*, 99 F.3d 807, 811 (6th Cir. 1996). However, federal courts have the inherent power to impose appropriate sanctions, including restrictions on future access to the judicial system, to deter future frivolous, harassing or duplicative lawsuits. *See Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43-45 (1991); *Filipas v. Lemons*, 835 F.2d 1145, 1146 (6th Cir. 1987). *Accord First Bank of Marietta v. Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co.*, 307 F.3d 501, 513 (6th Cir. 2002) (courts possess inherent authority to sanction bad-faith conduct without regard to whether such conduct could be sanctioned under other applicable rules or statutes). Pursuant to the Court’s inherent power, the Court may impose pre-filing restrictions on an individual with a history of repetitive or vexatious litigation. *Ortman*, 99 F.3d at 811; *Feathers v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 141 F.3d 264, 269 (6th Cir. 1998). A prolific litigator may be required to obtain leave of Court before any further

complaints will be accepted for filing, *see Filipas*, 835 F.2d at 1146, and the Court may deny a vexatious litigant permission to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See, e.g., Reneer v. Sewell*, 975 F.2d 258, 260-61 (6th Cir. 1992); *Maxberry v. SEC*, 879 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1989). *See also In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. at 180.

This Court need not wait for Ms. Levy's filings to reach the outlandish numbers found in other federal district courts around the country before placing a halt to her frivolous litigation. Obviously, the numerous sanctions already imposed by other federal courts have not deterred Ms. Levy. Ms. Levy's history of abusive and vexatious litigation and her frivolous and baseless allegations in this matter evidence her bad faith and warrant pre-filing sanctions. Ms. Levy's persistent submission of frivolous lawsuits serves no legitimate purpose, wastes the Court's resources, and deprives other litigants with meritorious claims of speedy resolution of their cases. Requiring court review of any proposed future filings by Ms. Levy would likely result in a waste of scarce judicial resources. *See Moore v. Hillman*, Nos. 4:06-cv-43, *et seq.*, 2006 WL 1313880, at *5 (W.D. Mich. May 12, 2006) (citing *Sassower v. American Bar Assn.*, 33 F.3d 733, 736 (7th Cir. 1994)). To deal with such a problem, courts have restricted pro se litigants from filing further pro se actions without a certification from the Court or an attorney that the claims asserted are not frivolous and that the lawsuit is not brought for any improper purpose. *See Ortman*, 99 F.3d at 811; *Sawchyn v. Parma Municipal Court*, 114 F.3d 1188 (table), 1997 WL 321112, at *1 (6th Cir. June 11, 1997); *May v. Guckenberger*, No. C-1-00-794, 2001 WL 1842462, at *6 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 26, 2001). The Court finds that a similar sanction is appropriate in this case to deter Ms. Levy from filing future vexatious and frivolous lawsuits in this Court.

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The complaint be **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) on the ground it is frivolous and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) on the ground it fails to state a claim to relief.
2. Plaintiff's motions for leave to amend/supplement the complaint (Doc. 24, 27) be **DENIED**.
3. Defendant's motion to strike the second amended complaint (Doc. 20) and plaintiff's motion for relief on a certain date (Doc. 14), revised motion for relief (Doc. 15), and motion to strike the motion to dismiss and receive court documents via email (Doc. 25) be **DENIED** as moot.
5. Amanda U. Levy/Amanda Ajuluchuku/Amanda Levy-Ajuluchuku be **ENJOINED** from filing any future civil actions in the Southern District of Ohio unless the complaint is first certified as non-frivolous by an attorney in good standing in this Court or the jurisdiction in which he or she is admitted. The Clerk of Court should be directed to reject any complaint from Amanda U. Levy/Amanda Ajuluchuku/Amanda Levy-Ajuluchuku unless she complies with the Court's pre-filing certification instructions and pays the full filing fee.
5. The Court certify pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) that for the foregoing reasons an appeal of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation would not be taken in good faith and therefore deny plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff remains free to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. See *Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803 (6th Cir. 1999), overruling in part *Floyd v. United States Postal Serv.*, 105 F.3d 274, 277 (6th Cir. 1997).

Date: 10/22/13


Karen L. Litkovitz
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

AMANDA U. LEVY,
Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:13-cv-147
Barrett, J.
Litkovitz, M.J

vs.

MACY'S, INC.,
Defendant.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).



Civil Party Search
Thu Oct 17 16:04:05 2013
313 records found

User: ux3930 E

Client:

Search: Civil Party Search Name ajuluchuku All Courts Page: 1

Party Name ▼	Court	Case	NOS	Date Filed	Date Closed
1 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2004-cv-10146	320	12/13/2004	01/03/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Saint James Episcopal Church					
2 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2004-cv-10147	360	12/13/2004	01/03/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Torrance Unified School District					
3 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2004-cv-10148	360	12/13/2004	01/03/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. W Lynn Brown					
4 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2004-cv-10149	360	12/13/2004	01/03/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. LAUSD					
5 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2004-cv-10150	360	12/13/2004	01/03/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Computer Sciences Corporation					
6 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-01766	350	03/10/2005	04/04/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Thomas Wire Law Offices					
7 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-04104	446	06/07/2005	06/24/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Robert S Levy					
8 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-04101	446	06/07/2005	06/24/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Ozurovich and Schwartz Law Offices of					
9 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-04105	446	06/07/2005	06/24/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Thomas Wire Law Offices of					
10 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-04186	440	06/09/2005	06/24/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Law Office of Thomas Wire					
11 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05542	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Thomas Wire Law Offices of					
12 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05544	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Thomas Wire Law Offices of					
13 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05545	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Computer Sciences Corporation					
14 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05546	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Thomas Wire Law Offices of					
15 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05698	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. W Lynne Brown					
16 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05700	440	09/11/2006	09/26/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. JP Morgan Chase and Co					
17 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05818	440	09/14/2006	09/25/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Robin Symons et al					
18 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05819	440	09/14/2006	09/25/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Pavilions et al					
19 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05921	440	09/18/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Chevy Chase Bank					
20 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05922	445	09/18/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Verizon Communications Inc					
21 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05923	440	09/18/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Boeing					
22 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05547	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. W Lynn Brown et al					
23 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05549	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Ozurovich and Schwartz Law Offices of					
24 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05550	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Robert S Levy					
25 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05551	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. LAUSD					
26 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05552	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Torrance Unified School District					
27 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2005-cv-05553	446	08/01/2005	08/19/2005
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Saint James Episcopal Church					
28 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05687	440	09/11/2006	09/26/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Extended Stay America					
29 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05924	440	09/18/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Morgan State University					
30 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05925	440	09/18/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Amtrak					
31 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05900	440	09/15/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Victorias Secret et al					
32 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05903	440	09/15/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Sears					
33 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05897	440	09/15/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Macys et al					
34 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-06091	440	09/25/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. SunTrust Banks Incorporated					
35 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-06093	440	09/25/2006	10/13/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. D Albert Brannen et al					
36 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	cacdce	2:2012-cv-09352	440	10/31/2012	11/28/2012
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Chase Bank					
37 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	cacdce	2:2013-cv-00314	440	01/15/2013	02/06/2013
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Citibank					
38 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	1:2005-cv-00475	870	04/07/2005	05/06/2005
Amanda Ajuluchuku v. IRS					
39 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-01606	442	06/15/2012	01/11/2013
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Victoria's Secret					
40 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-01607	442	06/15/2012	03/26/2013

Case: 1:13-cv-00147-MRB-KLL Doc #: 28 Filed: 10/22/13 Page: 15 of 20 PAGEID #: 89

<u>Party Name</u> ▼	<u>Court</u>	<u>Case</u>	<u>NOS</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>	<u>Date Closed</u>
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Google					
41 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-01805	446	06/15/2012	01/04/2013
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. State of Maryland					
42 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-01855	440	07/13/2012	01/03/2013
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Macy's et al					
43 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05690	440	09/11/2006	09/26/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. People Assisting the Homeless					
44 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05691	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Wells Fargo and Co					
45 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05692	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Scott Oswald et al					
46 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05693	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Bank of America					
47 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05694	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Washington Mutual Incorporated					
48 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05696	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Baltimore County Police					
49 Ajuluchuku, Amanda (pla)	cacdce	2:2006-cv-05697	440	09/11/2006	09/29/2006
Amanda U Ajuluchuku v. Robert Ward Jr et al					
50 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-02172	440	08/20/2012	01/11/2013
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Citibank					
51 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-02173	440	08/20/2012	10/09/2012
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Chase Bank					
52 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-02205	440	08/23/2012	11/30/2012
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Apple, Inc.					
53 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-02203	440	08/23/2012	01/04/2013
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. United Air Lines					
54 Ajuluchuku, Amanda U. (pla)	caedce	2:2012-cv-02494	440	10/04/2012	11/14/2012
(PS) Ajuluchuku v. Extended Stay, et al					

Receipt 10/17/2013 16:04:06 76119981

User ux3930 E

Client

Description Civil Party Search

Name ajuluchuku All Courts Page: 1

Pages 1 (\$0.08)



Civil Party Search
Thu Oct 17 15:58:07 2013
54 records found

User: ux3930 E

Client:

Search: Civil Party Search Name levy, amanda All Courts Page: 1

Party Name ▼	Court	Case	NOS	Date Filed	Date Closed
1 Levy, Amanda (pla)	ilndce	1:2013-cv-02005	440	03/12/2013	03/20/2013
Levy v. Hyatt Hotels Corporation					
2 Levy, Amanda (pla)	ncwdce	3:2013-cv-00136	440	02/28/2013	07/09/2013
Levy v. Extended Stay America					
3 Levy, Amanda U (pla)	scdce	7:2013-cv-00565	446	03/04/2013	10/11/2013
Levy v. Dennys Corporation					
4 Levy, Amanda U (pla)	txndce	3:2006-cv-00612	360	04/06/2006	09/27/2006
Ajuluchuku v. Wachovia Corporation					
5 Levy, Amanda U (pla)	txndce	3:2013-cv-02177	360	06/11/2013	08/07/2013
Levy v. 7-Eleven Stores					
6 Levy, Amanda U (pet)	txsdce	4:2013-mc-00411		03/04/2013	03/12/2013
Levy v. BP Corporation. DO NOT DOCKET IN MC 13-411. ENTRIES SHOULD BE MADE IN THE RELATED CML CASE.					
7 Levy, Amanda U (pla)	txsdce	4:2013-cv-00688	446	03/11/2013	09/11/2013
Levy v. BP Corporation					
8 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-00950	440	02/07/2013	03/29/2013
Levy v. Chase Bank					
9 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01286	440	02/25/2013	04/23/2013
Levy v. Forbes Magazine					
10 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01287	440	02/25/2013	03/29/2013
Levy v. JP Morgan Chase					
11 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01288	440	02/25/2013	05/14/2013
Levy v. City of University of New York (Hunter College)					
12 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01386	440	02/26/2013	05/29/2013
Levy v. Fox News Corporation					
13 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01385	440	02/26/2013	03/18/2013
Levy v. ABC News et al					
14 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01849	440	03/19/2013	04/03/2013
Levy v. Google, Inc.					
15 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	arwdce	5:2013-cv-05046	360	03/04/2013	
Levy v. Walmart Stores, Inc.					
16 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	cacdce	2:2013-cv-03464	440	05/14/2013	05/28/2013
Amanda U Levy v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc					
17 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	cacdce	2:2013-cv-03457	440	05/14/2013	
Amanda U Levy v. Famimal!					
18 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	cacdce	2:2013-cv-06036	360	08/16/2013	08/23/2013
Amanda U Levy v. W Lynne Brown et al					
19 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	3:2013-cv-00893	446	02/27/2013	06/03/2013
Levy v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc. (Santa Monica)					
20 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	3:2013-cv-00892	446	02/27/2013	04/16/2013
Levy v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc. (North Hollywood)					
21 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	3:2013-cv-00927	446	02/28/2013	06/03/2013
Levy v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc. (Sacramento)					
22 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01853	440	03/19/2013	05/29/2013
Levy v. ClearChannel					
23 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01969	440	03/25/2013	05/08/2013
v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc					
24 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02028	440	03/25/2013	05/29/2013
Levy v. Apple, Inc.					
25 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02039	440	03/26/2013	08/16/2013
Levy v. Centerbridge Partners, L.P.					
26 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-01968	440	03/25/2013	04/10/2013
Levy v. McDonalds Corporation					
27 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02021	440	03/25/2013	05/20/2013
Levy v. Starbucks Corporation					
28 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02022	440	03/25/2013	04/10/2013
Levy v. United Airlines, Inc.					
29 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	4:2013-cv-02076	445	05/07/2013	07/10/2013
Levy v. Google, Inc.					
30 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	4:2013-cv-02075	360	05/07/2013	07/10/2013
Levy v. Apple, Inc.					
31 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	3:2013-cv-02077	360	05/07/2013	06/03/2013
Levy v. 24 Hour Fitness Worldwide, Inc.					
32 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	4:2013-cv-03838	445	08/19/2013	09/23/2013
Levy v. Google, Inc.					
33 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	candce	4:2013-cv-04143	360	09/06/2013	10/03/2013
Levy v. Apple, Inc.					
34 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ctdce	3:2013-cv-00810	443	06/05/2013	06/10/2013
Levy v. Subway					
35 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	flsdce	1:2013-cv-20763	360	03/04/2013	04/26/2013
Levy v. Burger King, Inc.					
36 Levy, Amanda U. (inre)	ilndce	1:2013-cv-02544	999	04/05/2013	04/05/2013
In Re: Amanda U. Levy					
37 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ilndce	1:2013-cv-01849	446	03/04/2013	04/04/2013
Levy v. United Airlines, Inc.					
38 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ilndce	1:2013-cv-01666	446	03/04/2013	09/26/2013
Levy v. McDonalds Corporation					
39 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	mddce	1:2013-cv-00725	440	03/08/2013	04/02/2013
Levy v. Baltimore County Police Department					
40 LEVY, AMANDA U. (pla)	njdce	2:2013-cv-01300	440	03/04/2013	06/12/2013

Party Name ▼	Court	Case	NOS	Date Filed	Date Closed
LEVY v. THE FOOD EMPORIUM et al					
41 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-00948	440	02/07/2013	03/29/2013
Levy v. NBC Universal					
42 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-00949	440	02/07/2013	03/29/2013
Levy v. Citibank					
43 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02025	440	03/25/2013	06/12/2013
Levy v. Baltimore County Police Department					
44 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02026	440	03/25/2013	05/08/2013
Levy v. Famima!!					
45 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02098	440	03/28/2013	04/05/2013
Levy v. California State Library et al					
46 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-02099	440	03/28/2013	06/12/2013
Levy v. Burger King, Inc.					
47 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nysdce	1:2013-cv-04264	360	06/20/2013	07/01/2013
(PS) Levy v. Chase Bank et al					
48 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ohsdce	2:2013-cv-00067	360	01/25/2013	06/20/2013
Levy v. Limited Brands					
49 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ohsdce	1:2013-cv-00128	360	02/19/2013	
Levy v. Bloomingdales (Macy's)					
50 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ohsdce	1:2013-cv-00147	360	03/04/2013	
Levy v. Macy's (Sacramento)					
51 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ohsdce	1:2013-cv-00148	360	03/04/2013	
Levy v. Macy's (Century City)					
52 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	pamdcce	1:2013-cv-00629	440	03/08/2013	04/22/2013
Levy v. Rite Aid Corporation					
53 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	txwdce	5:2013-cv-00162	360	03/01/2013	08/21/2013
Levy v. ClearChannel (LA)					
54 Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	txwdce	5:2013-cv-00171	360	03/04/2013	07/18/2013
Levy v. ClearChannel (NYC)					

Receipt 10/17/2013 15:58:08 76116767

User ux3930 E

Client

Description Civil Party Search

Name levy, amanda All Courts Page: 1

Pages 1 (\$0.08)



Civil Party Search
Thu Oct 17 16:07:38 2013
39 records found

User: ux3930 E

Client:

Search: Civil Party Search Name ajuluchuku-levy All Courts Page: 1

Party Name ▼	Court	Case	NOS	Date Filed	Date Closed
1 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2008-cv-00567	440	01/29/2008	02/13/2008
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Bernard A. Rax et al					
2 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2008-cv-07115	440	10/28/2008	11/10/2008
Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Rescigno et al					
3 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05111	445	07/15/2009	12/24/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Accountpros et al					
4 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05115	445	07/15/2009	03/02/2010
Amanda Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Accountants, Inc. et al					
5 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05116	445	07/15/2009	09/14/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Ajilon Finance et al					
6 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05118	445	07/15/2009	10/15/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. American Express Co et al					
7 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05119	440	07/15/2009	10/14/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Argosy University et al					
8 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05120	440	07/15/2009	09/22/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Bank of America et al					
9 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05122	440	07/15/2009	10/13/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Bank of North Carolina et al					
10 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05124	440	07/15/2009	01/22/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Cecil Hotel					
11 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05125	440	07/15/2009	02/09/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Comerica Bank et al					
12 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05151	440	07/15/2009	01/22/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. McDonald's et al					
13 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05155	445	07/15/2009	10/30/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Michael Page International et al					
14 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05126	440	07/15/2009	10/02/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. CVS Pharmacy et al					
15 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05131	440	07/15/2009	02/09/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. FedEx Office et al					
16 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05132	440	07/15/2009	11/09/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Employment Development Department et al					
17 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05130	440	07/15/2009	02/09/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Great Stops					
18 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05148	440	07/15/2009	07/23/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Los Angeles County Sheriff					
19 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05158	440	07/15/2009	10/30/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. New Image Emergency Shelter					
20 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05160	440	07/15/2009	11/13/2009
Amandan U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Radio Shack et al					
21 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05161	445	07/15/2009	02/09/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Remx Financial Staffing					
22 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05162	440	07/15/2009	08/24/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. RBC Bank et al					
23 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05163	440	07/15/2009	09/22/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Super Shuttle Transportation et al					
24 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05164	445	07/15/2009	08/24/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Tutor.Com					
25 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05134	445	07/15/2009	10/15/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Dallas Employment Services, Inc.					
26 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05138	440	07/15/2009	01/22/2010
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security					
27 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05141	440	07/15/2009	11/24/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Hunter College et al					
28 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05166	445	07/16/2009	09/03/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Insurance One Agency					
29 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	8:2009-cv-00814	446	07/15/2009	10/21/2009
Ujuluchuku Levy v. Good Nite Inn et al					
30 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	8:2009-cv-00815	440	07/15/2009	10/28/2009
Amanda U Ajuluchuku Levy v. Kentucky Fried Chicken et al					
31 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-05165	445	07/15/2009	11/24/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Volt Services Group et al					
32 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U (pla)	cacdce	2:2009-cv-06059	440	08/19/2009	08/27/2009
Amanda U. Ajuluchuku-Levy v. JVS Work Source Center					
33 AJULUCHUKU-LEVY, AMANDA U. (pla)	ncmdce	1:2005-cv-00994	446	11/15/2005	06/16/2008
AJULUCHUKU v. BB & T CORP.					
34 AJULUCHUKU-LEVY, AMANDA U. (pla)	ncmdce	1:2007-cv-00068	440	01/29/2007	10/24/2007
AJULUCHUKU v. GREENSBORO URBAN MINISTRY					
35 AJULUCHUKU-LEVY, AMANDA U. (pla)	ncmdce	1:2007-cv-00069	440	01/29/2007	02/05/2008
AJULUCHUKU v. STACEY					
36 AJULUCHUKU-LEVY, AMANDA U. (pla)	ncmdce	1:2007-cv-00103	440	02/09/2007	06/04/2007
AJULUCHUKU v. NNAKWE					
37 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U. (cd)	nyedce	2:2008-cv-01752	440	05/07/2008	12/16/2009
Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Schleifer et al					
38 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	nyedce	2:2008-cv-01752	440	05/07/2008	12/16/2009
Ajuluchuku-Levy v. Schleifer et al					
39 Ajuluchuku-Levy, Amanda U. (pla)	ridce	1:2008-cv-00538	440	12/29/2008	01/30/2009
Ajuluchuku-Levy v. CVS Corporation					

User ux3930 E	Receipt 10/17/2013 16:07:39 76121748
Client	
Description Civil Party Search	
Name ajuluchuku-levy All Courts Page: 1	
Pages 1 (\$0.08)	

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. ■ Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. ■ Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits. 		A. Signature X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Addressee	
1. Article Addressed to: Amanda U. Levy PO Box 5471 Beverly Hills, CA 90209		B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery	
		D. Is delivery address different from item 1? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: <input type="checkbox"/> No	
		3. Service Type <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Registered <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt for Merchandise <input type="checkbox"/> Insured Mail <input type="checkbox"/> C.O.D.	
		4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)		7011 3500 0001 5345 9534	